

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 12958

Title: Observed Communication Between Oncologists and Patients: A Causal Model of Communicative Competence,

Reviewer code: 00183238

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-31 18:07

Date reviewed: 2014-08-05 05:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting and innovative approach of systematic review on an important clinical challenge

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 12958

Title: Observed Communication Between Oncologists and Patients: A Causal Model of Communicative Competence,

Reviewer code: 00012963

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-31 18:07

Date reviewed: 2014-08-15 16:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study, indicating that oncologists can directly influence patient satisfaction, by training and adopting specific behavioral patterns. I would suggest including a Table listing the details of the included studies to provide additional detail on the data sources employed. Some explanatory notes accompanying Figures 1 and 2 would enable their better understanding by the readership. Some small revisions could be entertained to improve understanding in the sentences cited below: Abstract "The more positive reaction a patient has to negative news increases adherence and speed of treatment." – may consider rephrasing "positive reaction" P 13, para 1: "The decision was to try the model by simply assuming that rather than a mediated relationship (using patient involvement and patient activity) the impact of provider patient-centered utterances would have a direct impact." This is unclear

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 12958

Title: Observed Communication Between Oncologists and Patients: A Causal Model of Communicative Competence,

Reviewer code: 00742266

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-31 18:07

Date reviewed: 2014-08-03 01:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Unfortunately, the study does not address the cultural difference when approaching patients from different backgrounds with their culture difference in dealing, acceting and following up with the treatment guidelines